DELAWARE POPULATION GROWTH

1975 ESTIMATES AND PROJECTIONS TO 1995 FOR THE STATE AND MAJOR CIVIL DIVISIONS

Prepared for
Delaware Population Consortium

by
Norfleet W. Rives, Jr.
and
C. Harold Brown

Division of Urban Affairs
University of Delaware
November 1975

DELAWARE POPULATION GROWTH: 1975 ESTIMATES AND PROJECTIONS TO 1995 FOR THE STATE AND MAJOR CIVIL DIVISIONS

Prepared For
Delaware Population Consortium

by
Norfleet W. Rives, Jr.
and
C. Harold Brown

Division of Urban Affairs
University of Delaware
October 1975

This report was prepared by the Division of Urban Affairs under contract with the Delaware State Planning Office and was financed in part through a comprehensive planning grant from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (Contract No. CPA-DE-03-26-1010/1101/2).

* * *

FOREWORD

The Delaware Population Consortium was formed during August 1975 with the purpose of providing a continuing forum for debate and discussion on matters relating to state and local population growth. This report represents the first installment in what will hopefully be a series of efforts by Consortium members to achieve greater coordination between consumers and producers of demographic information.

The authors gratefully acknowledge the cooperation and support of the following Consortium members who participated in the development of the projection assumptions.

State of Delaware
Office of State Planning
David Keifer, Director
Helen Gelof
Benjamin Coston

State of Delaware
Department of Natural Resources
and Environmental Control
Division of Environmental Control
N. C. Vasuki, Director
James Pase

State of Delaware
Department of Community Affairs
and Economic Development
John D. Daniello

State of Delaware
Department of Highways and
Transportation
Charles Workman
Rama Singh

Hammer, Siler, George Assoc.
Praful Shah

Kent County
Planning Office
Robert O'Brien, Director
Dale Herbert

City of Newark
Planning Department
William J. Cohen, Director
Annette G. Mehan

New Castle County
Department of Planning
Richard M. Bauer, Director
Edward J. O'Donnell
Paul G. Dentiste

Sussex County
Planning and Zoning Commission
Roland Derrickson

City of Wilmington
Department of Planning and
Development
Patricia Schramm, Director
Arnold Budin
Donn Devine

WILMAPCO
James H. Tung, Director
Christine Gudell

208 Areawide Waste Treatment
Management Program
Merna Hurd, Program Administrator
Darryl Goehring
Bernard Dworsky

Norfleet W. Rives, Jr.
C. Harold Brown
Edward C. Ratledge
Division of Urban Affairs
University of Delaware

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
METHODOLOGY	2
Population Estimates	2
Population Projections	6
Household Projections	10
ASSUMPTIONS	11
Population Projections	11
Household Projections	19
LIMITATIONS	21

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
A.	Summary of Assumptions for Mortality, Fertility, and Net Migration for New Castle County, Kent County, Sussex County, Wilmington, Newark, and Dover: 1980-1995	18
1.	Total Population of Delaware and Major Civil Divisions, by Sex: July 1, 1975, and Midyear Projections, 1980, 1985, 1990, and 1995	22
2.	Occupied Housing Units for the State of Delaware and Major Civil Divisions: July 1, 1975, and Midyear Projections, 1980, 1985, 1990, and 1995	23
3.	Estimates of the Total Population of New Castle County and Component Planning Districts and Civil Divisions, and Related Statistics: July 1, 1975	24
4.	Female Population of Delaware, by Age: July 1, 1975, and Midyear Projections, 1980, 1985, 1990, and 1995	25
5.	Male Population of Delaware, by Age: July 1, 1975, and Midyear Projections, 1980, 1985, 1990, and 1995	26
6.	Total Population of Delaware, by Age: July 1, 1975, and Midyear Projections, 1980, 1985, 1990, and 1995	27
7.	Female Population of New Castle County, by Age: July 1, 1975, and Midyear Projections, 1980, 1985, 1990, and 1995	28
8.	Male Population of New Castle County, by Age: July 1, 1975, and Midyear Projections, 1980, 1985, 1990, and 1995	29
9.	Total Population of New Castle County, by Age: July 1, 1975, and Midyear Projections, 1980, 1985, 1990, and 1995	30
10.	Female Population of Kent County, by Age: July 1, 1975, and Midyear Projections, 1980, 1985, 1990, and 1995	31
11.	Male Population of Kent County, by Age: July 1, 1975, and Midyear Projections, 1980, 1985, 1990, and 1995	32

Table		Page
12.	Total Population of Kent County, by Age: July 1, 1975, and Mid-year Projections, 1980, 1985, 1990, and 1995	33
13.	Female Population of Sussex County, by Age: July 1, 1975, and Midyear Projections, 1980, 1985, 1990, and 1995	34
14.	Male Population of Sussex County, by Age: July 1, 1975, and Midyear Projections, 1980, 1985, 1990, and 1995	35
15.	Total Population of Sussex County, by Age: July 1, 1975, and Midyear Projections, 1980, 1985, 1990, and 1995	36
16.	Female Population of Wilmington, by Age: July 1, 1975, and Mid-year Projections, 1980, 1985, 1990, and 1995	37
17.	Male Population of Wilmington, by Age: July 1, 1975, and Mid-year Projections, 1980, 1985, 1990, and 1995	38
18.	Total Population of Wilmington, by Age: July 1, 1975, and Mid-year Projections, 1980, 1985, 1990, and 1995	39
19.	Female Population of Newark, by Age: July 1, 1975, and Midyear Projections, 1980, 1985, 1990, and 1995	40
20.	Male Population of Newark, by Age: July 1, 1975, and Midyear Projections, 1980, 1985, 1990, and 1995	41
21.	Total Population of Newark, by Age: July 1, 1975, and Midyear Projections, 1980, 1985, 1990, and 1995	42
22.	Female Population of Dover, by Age: July 1, 1975, and Midyear Projections, 1980, 1985, 1990, and 1995	43
23.	Male Population of Dover, by Age: July 1, 1975, and Midyear Projections, 1980, 1985, 1990, and 1995	44
24.	Total Population of Dover, by Age: July 1, 1975, and Midyear Projections, 1980, 1985, 1990, and 1995	45
25.	Female Migration Ratios, by Age, for the Population of New Castle County: 1975-1980 to 1990-1995	46
26.	Male Migration Ratios, by Age, for the Population of New Castle County: 1975-1980 to 1990-1995	47
27.	Female Migration Ratios, by Age, for the Population of Kent County: 1975-1980 to 1990-1995	48

Table Page

28. Male Migration Ratios, by Age: for the Population of Kent County: 1975-1980 to 1990-1995 49

29. Female Migration Ratios, by Age, for the Population of Sussex County: 1975-1980 to 1990-1995 50

30. Male Migration Ratios, by Age, for the Population of Sussex County: 1975-1980 to 1990-1995 51

31. Female Migration Ratios, by Age, for the Population of Wilmington: 1975-1980 to 1990-1995 52

32. Male Migration Ratios, by Age, for the Population of Wilmington: 1975-1980 to 1990-1995 53

33. Female Migration Ratios, by Age, for the Population of Newark: 1975-1980 to 1990-1995 54

34. Male Migration Ratios, by Age, for the Population of Newark: 1975-1980 to 1990-1995 55

35. Female Migration Ratios, by Age, for the Population of Dover: 1975-1980 to 1990-1995 56

36. Male Migration Ratios, by Age, for the Population of Dover: 1975-1980 to 1990-1995 57

37. Female Survival Ratios, by Age: 1975-1980 to 1990-1995 58

38. Male Survival Ratios, by Age: 1975-1980 to 1990-1995 59

39. General Fertility Rates: 1975-1980 to 1990-1995 60

INTRODUCTION

Information concerning the future course of population growth is essential to the formation of rational plans for economic and social development. An increasing number of civil servants engaged in the planning function have begun to realize that responsible public programming depends upon an adequate knowledge of the demographic situation. Program planning and budgeting for public goods and services cannot be done in an effective and realistic manner without the use of demographic estimates and projections.

This report presents estimates for July 1, 1975, and midyear projections to 1995 for the population of the State of Delaware and the population of major civil divisions. These include New Castle County, Kent County, Sussex County, and the cities of Wilmington, Newark, and Dover. Separate population estimates for July 1, 1975, are presented for the component planning districts of New Castle County. The reader should note that all estimates and projections for New Castle County include the City of Wilmington.

METHODOLOGY

The following discussions concern the methodology used to assemble the statistical information presented in this report. The first discussion focuses on the population estimates, the second on the population projections, and the third on the household projections. All estimates and projections were prepared using conventional techniques of demographic and statistical analysis.

Population Estimates.

The population estimates presented in this report are dated July 1, 1975. The estimates for New Castle County and component civil divisions, including Wilmington, Newark, and the county planning districts, were prepared using a survey variant of the housing unit method for small-area population estimates. The estimates for Kent County, Sussex County, and the City of Dover are derived from estimates prepared by the Census Bureau in conjunction with the Federal-State Cooperative Program for Population Estimates. The different methods can be summarized in the following manner.

The housing unit method makes use of electric utility data or residential building permits and demolition data to gauge postcensal change in the local housing stock. The estimated current number of occupied units is then translated into an estimate of population, using current information on average household size.[1] The accuracy of the method depends to a large extent on two factors: (1) how precisely current population per household can be estimated, and (2) how precisely the local stock of housing can be monitored. Neither factor should be a major concern in this particular study. The Census

[1]See P. Morrison, Demographic Information for Cities: A Manual for Estimating and Projecting Local Population Characteristics (Santa Monica, California: RAND Corporation, 1971), pp. 22-23, 138-141.

and Data System of the Division of Urban Affairs provides for continuous monitoring of the housing stock of New Castle County. The various geographic base files are updated at regular intervals, making current estimates of the number of housing units accurate within a relatively small margin of error. The current population per household for any geographic area within New Castle County can be measured with predetermined precision using the household survey.

The housing unit method is based on the equation

$$P = A(H)(1 - V)/(1 - G),$$

where P is the estimated population, A is average household size, H is the number of housing units, V is the household vacancy rate, and G is the proportion of the population in group quarters (population outside households).

To estimate the current population of New Castle County and component civil divisions, information on A and V was developed from a series of household surveys. A systematic random sample of 100 households was drawn for each of the county planning districts and respondents were asked to provide information on the number of persons, as of September 1, 1975, who usually resided in the household. Three 100-household samples were drawn for each of the cities of Wilmington and Newark. With the exception of Newark, all surveys were conducted by personal interview to insure reasonable response rates; in all cases, nonresponse was negligible. The Newark survey was conducted on a mail basis several weeks prior to the other surveys and as part of another project. In the case of each survey, the list of residential addresses (sampling frame) from which the sample units were drawn was based on the corresponding geographic base file monitored by the Census and Data System of the Division of Urban Affairs.

Each sample survey provided information on the population per occupied housing unit (A) and the household vacancy rate (V). The returns from the three samples in Wilmington and Newark were averaged to produce single estimates for A and V in each area. The data collected from the various surveys are shown in table 3. The reader should note that the household counts have been adjusted for errors referred to as frame specification errors. These include allowances for "no-such-address" housing units, commercial properties which were residential at the time of the most recent update of the geographic

base file, and housing units under construction at the time of the survey, even though these units may have already been added to the list of residential addresses. No correction for frame specification errors exceeded two percent. Household counts adjusted in this manner are considered better estimates of the current local housing stock than unadjusted counts.

The computational procedure for the current population estimate can be illustrated with an example. Consider the case of the Brandywine planning district. According to the sample survey, the average household contains 3.46 persons and five percent of the housing units are vacant.[1] According to the Census and Data System, the geographic base file for the Brandywine district contains 26,403 housing units, following a 0.2 percent adjustment for frame specification errors. The number of occupied housing units is given by the expression:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{occupied housing units} &= (H)(1 - V) \\ &= (26{,}403)(0.95) \\ &= 25{,}083. \end{aligned}$$

If the average household size is 3.46, then the estimated population in households is found by the expression:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{estimated population in households} &= (A)(H)(1 - V) \\ &= 3.46(25{,}083) \\ &= 86{,}787. \end{aligned}$$

The difference between the total population of the district and the population in households is the population in group quarters. An estimate of the fraction of total population in group quarters was prepared for each geographic area of New Castle County using information from the 1970 census, the most recent source of information available for this particular variable.[2] According to the 1970 census, 1.1 percent of the population in the Brandywine

---

[1] Since both of these figures are survey estimates, there will be some discrepancy between these figures and the true figures, owing to the random nature of sampling variation. The extent to which this discrepancy is significant depends on the size of the sample. Samples of 100 households each are sufficiently large to keep the error due to sampling variation well within tolerable limits. For a further discussion of this point, see L. Kish, Survey Sampling (New York: Wiley, 1965), pp. 49-53.

[2] See U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population: 1970, General Population Characteristics, Final Report, PC (1)-B9 Delaware, 1971, Table 33, p.49.

census county division (an area generally comparable to the planning district) resided in group quarters. This means that the estimate of population in households should be inflated by 1.1 percent to produce an estimate of total population. Performing this calculation yields the final population estimate (87,724) for the Brandywine planning district. Total population estimates for the other planning districts, Wilmington and Newark, were assembled in an identical manner.

The population estimates for Kent County, Sussex County, and Dover were derived from estimates prepared by the Census Bureau as part of the Federal-State Cooperative Program for Population Estimates.[1] The base data for Kent County and Sussex County are dated July 1, 1974, and the base estimate for Dover, developed originally for the current entitlement period of General Revenue Sharing, is dated July 1, 1973.[2] The 1975 midyear population estimates for Kent County and Sussex County were computed by exponential extrapolation using the average annual growth rate for the period from the 1970 census (April 1, 1970) to July 1, 1974. The 1975 estimate for Dover was obtained in a similar manner, but in this case, the extrapolation was made from July 1, 1973, to July 1, 1975, at the average annual growth rate for the period from the 1970 census to midyear 1973. The reader should note that prior to the extrapolation and to insure a correct estimate of the growth rate, the 1970 census count for Dover was adjusted to allow for postcensal annexation.

The population estimates for New Castle County and component civil divisions are considered better estimates than those prepared for the downstate areas, because the household survey approach represents a substantial refinement over methods involving extrapolation. This is not meant to suggest, however, that the downstate estimates are serious distortions of reality.

---

[1] Reports of the Federal-State Cooperative Program for Population Estimates are contained in Current Population Reports, Series P-26. See especially Report No. 21. All reports are available from the Population Division, Bureau of the Census.

[2] See U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-26 No. 111, May 1975, which contains estimates of Delaware counties and metropolitan areas for July 1, 1973 and 1974, and Series P-25, No. 553, May 1975, which contains midyear 1973 population estimates for incorporated places in Delaware.

The time period over which the population counts are extrapolated is too short to permit the incurrence of significant estimation errors. In any event, the greater reliability of population estimates derived from the household survey approach underscores the need to construct and monitor geographic base files for Kent County and Sussex County.

Population Projections.

The population projections presented in this report were prepared using conventional techniques of demographic analysis. The particular method chosen for this report is component project.[1] The component method projects population by projecting the separate components of growth--fertility, mortality, and migration. The basic projection mechanism is given by the expression:

$$P_1 = P_0 + B - D + M,$$

where P_1 is the projected population, P_0 is the initial population, B is the number of intervening births, D is the number of intervening deaths, and M is the number of intervening net migrants; the number of net migrants equals the number of inmigrants minus the number of outmigrants. The following discussion summarizes the actual computational procedure.

The point of departure for all component projections is an initial age distribution. The initial age distributions for the three counties and the three metropolitan areas were derived from the 1970 census.[2] An analysis of 1975 population data generated by the Census and Data System for selected school districts in New Castle County indicated only very minor changes in the age-sex structure of population between 1970 and 1975. On the basis of this finding, the age-sex distributions for July 1, 1975, were constructed

---

[1]For an excellent discussion of component projection, with illustrated examples, see N. Keyfitz, Introduction to the Mathematics of Population (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968), pp. 27-37.

[2]See U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population: 1970, General Population Characteristics, Final Report PC(1)-B9 Delaware, 1971, Tables 24, 28, and 35.

by applying the 1970 census proportionate age-sex distributions to the 1975 midyear population estimates. The assumption of an unchanged age-sex structure is less consequential when the assumption is made for a shorter time period and involves a relatively slowly growing population. The time period, 1970-1975, is not long by projection standards, and during this period, most of the populations under consideration were not characterized by rapid growth, with the possible exceptions of Kent County and the City of Dover. In any event, the use of the 1970 census statistics to construct age-sex distributions for 1975 should not create any serious problems for the actual projections. The age-sex structure of a population changes significantly only over longer time periods, even when the population is growing rapidly. The estimated populations for July 1, 1975, classified by sex and five-year age groups, are shown in the series of tables immediately following the text (see LIST OF TABLES).

Projecting future population growth involves a mechanically simple procedure. This procedure can be summarized in the following manner. Consider an initial population distributed by age and sex. The time interval between the date of this population and the first projection, and the time interval separating all subsequent projections, is called the projection period. The length of this period will be usually either one year or five years, depending on the age convention. Populations distributed by single years of age will produce annual projections, while populations arrayed by five-year age groups will produce quinquennial projections.

Suppose now, that an initial population distributed by quinquennial age groups and sex is to be projected for one projection period; according to the equation previously presented describing the basic projection mechanism, the projected population will require estimates of the number of births, deaths, and net migrants during the projection period.

The number of deaths occurring during the period is determined by the particular schedule of mortality. A mortality schedule consists of a series of age-sex specific survival ratios derived from the appropriate set of life tables. If $P(x,t)$ is the population cohort aged x at time t, and $S(x,x+n)$ is the expected proportion of any cohort surviving n years (based on the life table), then the expression:

$$P(x+n,t+n) = S(x,x+n)\ P(x,t)$$

yields the expected population cohort aged x+n at time t+n. This equation is used to determine the number of deaths occurring during the period to the population alive at the beginning of the period. The result of this calculation, using five-year age groups, is the projected population aged five and over on the basis of mortality alone.

The second step in the projection procedure is to determine the number of births during the interval. There are several ways in which this can be done, but the most common method involves the use of a general fertility rate. The general fertility rate is the ratio of the number of births during a year to the number of women of childbearing age at the midyear date. For example, if there are 3,689 women of childbearing age (usually ages 15 to 49) in a particular population at the midyear date, and these women produce 267 births during the year, then the general fertility rate would equal 0.072, or 72 births per 1,000 women of childbearing age. To project the number of births, the estimated general fertility rate is multiplied by the average number of women of childbearing age during the projection interval, and this product is then multiplied by the number of years in the projection period (in the present case, five years). The latter step is necessary because the general fertility rate is only an annual rate, and the period over which the births occur consists of several years (in the example, five years). The reader should note that the average number of women of childbearing age is obtained by averaging the female cohorts aged 15 to 49 in the initial and projected populations.

The number of births produced in the preceding step can now be survived using the appropriate survival ratio from the mortality schedule to yield the projected population under age five. Since the projections are made by sex, owing to significant differences in the age structure of female and male mortality, the projected birth cohort is usually divided into female and male births, using a predetermined sex ratio at birth, and then the appropriate sex-specific survival ratios are applied.

The final step in the projection procedure concerns the adjustment of the projected age-sex cohorts for the effect of net migration. There are several different adjustment methods, but in principle, they are all designed to produce the same result. The particular method chosen for this report is based on the net migration ratio. This ratio measures the proportionate

change in cohort size, during the projection period, attributable to net migration. The ratios can be estimated for any population for each age-sex cohort using two consecutive age-sex distributions which are n years apart. For example, if $P(x,t)$ is the cohort aged x at time t, and $S(x,x+n)$ is the n-year survival ratio, then, as before, the expected population surviving to age group $x+n$ at time $t+n$ is given by the equation:

$$P(x+n,t+n) = S(x,x+n)\ P(x,t).$$

This population will, of course, be n years older at time $t+n$. Finally, if the known population estimate for the cohort aged $x+n$ at time $t+n$ is $C(x+n,t+n)$, then the net migration ratio is defined by the equation:

$$R(x+n) = C(x+n,t+n)/P(x+n,t+n).$$

Values of the net migration ratio greater than one indicate a net increase in cohort size due to net migration, while values less than one indicate a net loss. To adjust the projected population for net migration, each age-sex cohort is multiplied by the estimated net migration ratio. When the net migration ratio method is used, the adjustment to the very youngest cohort in the projected population represents not only an adjustment for net migration of births, but also an adjustment for the additional births of migrant women. The reader may recall that no allowance was made for this additional source of fertility in the previous calculations.

To summarize the procedure for component projection:

1. An initial population classified by age and sex is constructed.

2. Survival ratios are applied to the age-sex cohorts at the beginning of the period to determine the number of survivors to the end of the period.

3. A general fertility rate is applied to the female population of childbearing age to determine the number of births during the period, and this number is then multiplied by the appropriate survival ratio to determine the projected population under age five.

4. The projected age-sex cohorts are adjusted for net migration.

This completes the computational procedure for population projections based on the component method.

Household Projections.

The purpose of a household projection is to project the number of occupied housing units (dwelling units) in a particular geographic area. The household projections presented in this report were assembled using the equation:

$$H_o = (1 - G)\ P/A,$$

where, in this case, H_o is the projected household count for occupied units, G is the proportion of population in group quarters, P is the projected total population, and A is the average household size. The product $(1 - G)P$ is the projected population in households which, when divided by the population per household, yields the projected household count.

The total number of housing units, occupied plus vacant, can be projected by applying a forecasted vacancy rate to values of H_o. The projection is based on the formula:

$$H_t = H_o/(1 - V),$$

where H_t is the projected total number of housing units and V is the projected vacancy rate. The household projections presented in this report are for occupied housing units only.

ASSUMPTIONS

An initial age distribution combined with a mechanically simple procedure will not produce a population projection. Certain assumptions about the behavior of fertility, mortality, and migration during the projection period must be made before any projection can be assembled. These assumptions are central to a projection, because they determine the particular form that a projection will take. Different assumptions will produce different projections, given the same initial age distribution. The credibility of a population projection depends on the plausibility of each assumption at a given point in time. If the assumptions are not plausible at this point in time, then the projection will find difficulty gaining acceptance, even though the passage of time may show the assumptions to have been correct.

The following discussions summarize the assumptions made for both the population and household projections. The population assumptions are presented first.

Population Projections.

Since component projections were prepared for three counties and three metropolitan areas, decisions had to be made regarding six sets of assumptions, each set containing specific statements regarding the projected future course of fertility, mortality, and migration.

Mortality. The mortality assumption for each area presents the least problem. Continuous improvements in disease control technology and preventive medicine have been responsible for more than a century of declining mortality in the United States. There is no evidence to suggest that Delaware has not been a party to these fortunate circumstances. The most recent life tables constructed for the State, based on mortality registration statistics for the period 1969-1971, place the mean expectation of life at birth at 70 years for the total population, with the female figure slightly higher, at 74 years,

and the male figure slightly lower, at 66 years.[1] The scientific community has forecasted further improvements in disease control technology and preventive medicine through the year 2000, but most experts agree that the incremental change in mortality will be smaller than before and more difficult to achieve. Under these circumstances, it would not be unreasonable to assume that mortality levels observed for the period 1969-1971 will continue at least through 1995. The assumption of unchanging mortality was applied to each of the six geographic areas. The state life tables were used to project mortality in each case, because life tables for counties and metropolitan areas are rarely constructed, owing to their methodological awkwardness. Survival ratios by age and sex, derived from the 1969-1971 Delaware life tables are shown in tables 37 and 38.

Fertility. Births were projected for each population for each time period using the general fertility rate. Changes in the rates between 1975 and 1995 were made by altering the rates reported for the period 1969-1971, the most recent period for which complete information on state and local birth registration is available. The 1969-1971 rates are:

Area	Rate
New Castle County	0.0674
Kent County	0.0877
Sussex County	0.0715
Wilmington	0.0914
Newark	0.0172
Dover	0.0677

The reader will note that Wilmington and the two downstate counties have the highest fertility. The metropolitan area has experienced high fertility for at least two decades, however, and this would suggest that Wilmington fertility has possibly stabilized. The two downstate counties, conversely, are largely rural areas, where fertility is traditionally higher than in urban centers. Kent County, however, is a rapidly urbanizing nonmetropolitan area,

---

[1] See N. W. Rives, Jr., Delaware Abridged Life Tables: 1969-1971 (Newark: Division of Urban Affairs, University of Delaware), pp. 8-10.

and under these circumstances, fertility is likely to decline slightly during the next several decades; declining fertility is a characteristic demographic response to urbanization. The impact of any urbanization on fertility in Sussex County is not likely to be significant prior to the end of the century, because the prospects for rapid urbanization in this area would seem more remote. Consequently, the assumption was made that fertility in Kent County will decline by 20 percent between 1975 and 1995, while Sussex fertility will remain constant at its present (1969-1971) level.

The three remaining areas, New Castle County, Newark, and Dover, are each characterized by relatively low general fertility rates. The Newark rate is suspiciously low, but there is really no evidence of any statistical irregularity. If the level of Newark fertility is actually as low as the rate indicates, then future population growth should be accompanied by slight gains in reproductive behavior. Specifically, the assumption was made that the 1995 level of Newark fertility would be 10 percent higher than the figure reported for the base period. Part of the problem with the depressed Newark fertility rate is the relatively large female population of childbearing age which resides in group quarters, principally university dormitories. From the standpoint of demographic methodology, these women are technically part of the childbearing population, and as usual residents of Newark, they must be counted as part of the Newark population of childbearing age. In practice, however, they do not bear children at the higher rates experienced by the average female of the same age, because their decision to attend college on a regular basis, to live in group quarters, and to delay marriage and family formation for significant periods, effectively constrains their reproductive behavior.

Dover, the other major urban place in Delaware, grew quite rapidly during the decade from 1960 to 1970, but fertility was never a major source of growth. The 1969-1971 general fertility rate is highest among the areas with lower fertility. Since Dover will continue urbanizing through the end of the century, it is not unreasonable to assume that fertility will decline slightly by 1995. Accordingly, the assumption was made that Dover fertility will decrease by 10 percent, a modest reduction, by the end of the projection period.

The fertility assumption for New Castle County was the most difficult to make, because the county is highly urbanized and densely populated, with generally low fertility. The next stage in the fertility evolution of this area would seem to be a slight increase in the level of reproductive behavior. County fertility declined rapidly between 1960 and 1970, following a well-known national trend, but the current philosophy of family formation suggests that part of the fertility decline reported for many urban areas between 1960 and 1970 may be due, in fact, to a change in the structure of child spacing. This means that some women may actually be planning on generally the same completed family size as the previous childbearing generations, but the method to achieve this goal involves a different time distribution of births over the family life cycle. If child spacing patterns for the immediate future are to favor births later in marriage, implying longer first- and second-order birth intervals, then present fertility rates will be somewhat lower than the rates one or two decades from now. Since it is not unreasonable that such behavior may affect fertility in New Castle County, the 1995 county fertility rate was assumed to be five percent higher than the figure for the base period.

The general fertility rates used to project each population to 1995 are shown in table 39. For areas where fertility was assumed to increase or decrease, the change was assumed to occur between 1980 and 1995. In these areas, the general fertility rates for each quinquennial projection period following 1980 were obtained by linear interpolation. The interpolation in each case was made to the midpoint of the interval. The decision to confine projected changes in fertility to the last three projection periods, rather than allowing the change to occur routinely over the full 20-year interval, is based on the well-documented conviction that present economic and social conditions have reduced household planning horizons to the extent that most plans for household expansion including childbearing, are simply either being held in abeyance or pursued with extreme caution. Since this mode of behavior is characteristic of the period following 1970, the two quinquennial periods from 1970 to 1980 are quite likely to exhibit similar patterns of demographic change, especially change involving fertility.

Migration. The projected future course of migration is difficult to establish for any population, because unlike fertility and mortality where general fertility rates and expectations of life are conveniently available for analysis, the migration variable has no easily interpreted summary measure. The net migration ratios used to project the populations in this report permit the distinction between two types of cohorts--cohorts which have been losing population on balance, and cohorts which have been gaining. The net migration ratios for each population for each age-sex cohort were estimated for the period 1970-1975, using the 1970 midyear age-sex distributions, derived from census statistics, and the age-sex population estimates for July 1, 1975. These calculations established the age-sex patterns of net migration for each geographic area for the five-year time interval immediately preceding the first projection period. Projected net migration ratios for each population were obtained by making specific assumptions about the future course of migration for age-sex cohorts experiencing net outmigration during the base period (1970-1975), and cohorts experiencing net inmigration. This distinction between cohorts losing population due to net outmigration and cohorts gaining population due to net inmigration facilitated considerably the difficult task of making assumptions.

The migration variable contributed significantly to the rapid growth of New Castle County during the 1960-1970 decade, but recent evidence compiled by the Census and Data System suggests that the county has actually been losing population due to net outmigration during the period since 1970. This can almost certainly be attributed to current economic conditions, however, and it is not considered indicative of any emerging trend. During the next several decades, as the regional economy undergoes what may be considered a transitional period of rehabilitation, population losses due to net outmigration should tend to decrease, while gains due to net inmigration should tend to increase but not to pre-1970 levels. This projected outcome will permit a modest amount of growth due to net migration. Specifically, net losses are assumed to decline by 30 percent by 1995, measured from the base period, and net gains are assumed to increase by 10 percent.

The two major urban areas of New Castle County, Wilmington and Newark, have contributed in quite different ways to county growth through net

migration. Newark grew very rapidly prior to 1970, almost doubling in size between the two most recent censuses. Most of this growth can be attributed to net migration. Conversely, Wilmington has been steadily declining in population since 1950, owing to substantial net outmigration. The Newark situation is characteristic of rapid urbanization, and the assumption was made that losses due to net outmigration (very few cohorts are in this category) will remain unchanged through 1995, while net gains will decline by 30 percent from the base period. This means that the net migration ratios showing a population gain for the base period are reduced by a factor of 0.70 for the projection from 1990 to 1995, while the base-period ratios showing a net population loss remain unchanged during the final projection period. The migration growth rate produced by this particular scheme will be somewhat lower than the overall rate due to net migration prior to 1970. The Wilmington situation merits somewhat different assumptions. In this case, net losses were reduced by 90 percent between 1975 and 1995, while net gains were increased by 50 percent from the base period. The principal justification for this assumption is the increasingly plausible speculation that the city will not continue to lose population through net outmigration indefinitely.

The migration assumptions for Newark provide a useful precedent for the assumptions to be made for Kent County and Dover. Both areas grew at impressive rates between 1960 and 1970, and like Newark, much of this growth can be attributed to net migration. Furthermore, like Newark, the two downstate areas are quite likely to grow less by net migration in the immediate future, as the process of urbanization fully matures. Consequently, the assumption was made that the rate of population gain through net migration will decline for Kent County and Dover by 50 and 70 percent, respectively, between the base period and 1995. Net population losses will remain unchanged at the base-period level for the entire projection period.

Sussex County is the most rural county in the State, and as such, the county least affected by urbanization. Between 1960 and 1970, the county lost population through net outmigration, but there is no evidence to suggest that this continues to be a major problem. It is not unreasonable to assume that some form of urbanization will ultimately affect county growth, possibly prior to the end of the century. During the projection period from 1975 to 1995,

however, the prospects for a significant-and-sustained type of urbanization, generating unprecedented rates of county growth, are considered remote.[1] Under these circumstances, the gradual rehabilitation of the regional economy should at least reduce the pace of net outmigration from the county. The assumption was made that during the projection period, net losses will decline by 10 percent over base-period losses, while net gains will remain unchanged from the 1970-1975 levels. Combined with the assumption of no change in fertility through 1995, the migration assumption will permit a modest county growth rate over the projection period.

This completes the discussion of the projection assumptions. The various assumptions for the six populations under consideration are summarized for the convenience of the reader in table A. The reader should note that the effect of the migration assumptions, like the effect of the fertility assumptions, is confined to the period 1980-1995. All changes during this period are assumed to occur in linear fashion, proceeding from the base-period ratios which, by assumption, are the same ratios used to project the six populations from 1975 to 1980. The rationale given to confine the projected changes in net migration to the period 1980-1995 is the same rationale presented in the case of projected fertility changes. The projected net migration ratios, classified by age and sex, are shown for each population in tables 25 through 36.

---

[1]This does not take into consideration the possible effects of offshore oil exploration and drilling. If such an event were to occur, it would obviously affect the rate of county urbanization, but under the circumstances, it is impossible to specify the particular impact of such an event on regional migration.

TABLE A

SUMMARY OF ASSUMPTIONS FOR MORTALITY, FERTILITY, AND NET MIGRATION FOR NEW CASTLE COUNTY, KENT COUNTY, SUSSEX COUNTY, WILMINGTON, NEWARK, AND DOVER

1980 - 1995

	New Castle	Kent	Sussex	Wilmington	Newark	Dover
Mortality			no change			
Fertility	5% increase	20% reduction	no change	no change	10% increase	10% reduction
Migration						
Net Losses	30% reduction	no change	10% reduction	90% reduction	no change	no change
Net Gains	10% increase	50% reduction	no change	50% increase	30% reduction	70% reduction

The projected populations, by age and sex, for each geographic area are shown in tables 4 through 24. The first three tables contain the projections for the State. These were obtained simply by adding the corresponding figures for the three counties. At this point, the reader is reminded that the projections for New Castle County include Wilmington. The total populations for each projection rate have been computed for the entire projection period to summarize the overall growth pattern.

Area	Percent Rate
Delaware	1.4
New Castle County	0.9
Kent County	2.5
Sussex County	2.1
Wilmington	0.6
Newark	1.9
Dover	2.4

These rates are a direct reflection of the particular assumptions made for each geographic area.

Household Projections.

The household projections assembled for this report are presented primarily for purposes of illustration. They are intended to depict the future housing situation through 1995, assuming no change in present (1975) levels of average household size and the proportion of the total population in group quarters.

Table 39 presents projected occupied housing units (households) through 1995, assuming the following household sizes and group-quarter rates for the entire projection period.

Area	A	G
New Castle County	3.15	0.052
Kent County	3.29	0.062
Sussex County	3.07	0.019
Wilmington	2.91	0.018
Newark	2.94	0.268
Dover	3.17	0.082

The symbols presented above are the symbols used to describe the household projection methodology. In the absence of more recent information, the average-household-size figures for Kent County, Sussex County, and Dover were derived from the 1970 census. The same source was used for the group-quarter rates.[1] Since the data shown in table 39 are based on the projected populations and the information presented above, the reader can readily make alternative household projections by simply changing one or more projection parameters--average household size or group-quarter rate. Projections can also be assembled for total housing units by assuming a forecasted vacancy rate.

[1] See U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population: 1970, General Population Characteristics, Final Report PC(1) - B9 Delaware, 1971, Tables 29, 36.

LIMITATIONS

The population projections presented in this report are subject to certain limitations. The reader should recognize these limitations and appreciate the restrictions they impose on interpretation. Two limitations deserve comment in the present context.

The first involves the general assumption that there will be no disastrous war, widespread epidemic, major economic depression, or similar catastrophe during the period under consideration. This assumption represents standard procedure in demographic analysis. Although extraordinary and unusual events can have a pronounced effect on population growth, the forecasting problem becomes sufficiently complex to render the task of prediction impractical.

The particular assumptions regarding the behavior of fertility, mortality, and migration during the projection period collectively represent the second limitation to which the projections are subject. The point cannot be overemphasized that a population projection is simply a mathematical statement of future population growth based on specific assumptions about the components of growth. If one or more assumptions are changed for whatever reason, then the projected populations will change. The reader is admonished always to recognize assumptions, appreciate them for their complexity, and judge them strictly on the basis of their plausibility. The credibility of a projection depends on the plausibility of each assumption at a given point in time. If the assumptions are not plausible at this point in time, then the projection will find difficulty gaining acceptance, even though the passage of time may show the assumptions to have been correct.

TABLE 1

TOTAL POPULATION OF DELAWARE AND MAJOR CIVIL DIVISIONS, BY SEX: JULY 1, 1975 AND MIDYEAR PROJECTIONS, 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995

AREA	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995
DELAWARE					
FEMALE	294255	313791	336912	362470	390248
MALE	280437	299157	320826	344702	370307
ALL CLASSES	574692	612948	657738	707172	760555
NEW CASTLE COUNTY					
FEMALE	202745	208982	217885	229450	243865
MALE	190903	196796	205293	216434	230350
ALL CLASSES	393648	405778	423178	445884	474215
KENT COUNTY					
FEMALE	46071	54502	63184	71024	77526
MALE	46959	55250	63252	70170	75401
ALL CLASSES	93030	109752	126436	141194	152927
SUSSEX COUNTY					
FEMALE	45439	50307	55843	61996	68857
MALE	42575	47111	52281	58098	64556
ALL CLASSES	88014	97418	108124	120094	133413
WILMINGTON CITY					
FEMALE	41402	40560	41133	42943	46274
MALE	35252	34756	35518	37424	40754
ALL CLASSES	76654	75316	76651	80367	87028
NEWARK CITY					
FEMALE	12643	14955	16949	18704	18743
MALE	12510	14543	16442	18013	18141
ALL CLASSES	25353	29498	33391	36717	36884
DOVER CITY					
FEMALE	12173	14409	16580	18332	19553
MALE	11044	13100	15077	16612	17676
ALL CLASSES	23217	27509	31657	34944	37229

The housing unit files maintained by the City of Wilmington contain more units than those maintained by the Division of Urban Affairs. Work is presently under way to resolve this discrepancy. The estimates and projections are based on the Division of Urban Affairs files.

TABLE 2

OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS FOR THE STATE OF DELAWARE AND MAJOR CIVIL DIVISIONS: JULY 1, 1975, AND MIDYEAR PROJECTIONS, 1980, 1985, 1990, AND 1995

Area	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995
Delaware	173,189	184,607	198,031	212,906	229,090
New Castle County	118,485	122,120	127,356	134,190	142,716
Kent County	26,580	31,358	36,125	40,341	43,693
Sussex County	28,124	31,129	34,550	38,375	42,681
Wilmington	25,855	25,416	25,866	27,120	29,368
Newark	6,307	7,344	8,314	9,142	9,183
Dover	6,723	7,966	9,168	10,119	10,781

Note: Number of housing units is number of household addresses.

The housing unit files maintained by the City of Wilmington contain more units than those maintained by the Division of Urban Affairs. Work is presently under way to resolve this discrepancy. The estimates and projections are based on the Division of Urban Affairs files.

TABLE 3

ESTIMATES OF THE TOTAL POPULATION OF
NEW CASTLE COUNTY AND COMPONENT PLANNING DISTRICTS AND
CIVIL DIVISIONS, AND RELATED STATISTICS:
JULY 1, 1975

Area	Average Household Size	Vacancy Rate	Household Count*	Population in Households	Group Quarters Adjustment	Total Population
Planning District						
Brandywine	3.46	0.050	26,403	86,787	0.011	87,724
Piedmont	3.20	0.022	4,879	15,269	0.034	15,808
Pike Creek-Central Kirkwood	3.21	0.030	9,895	30,810	0.002	30,874
Greater Newark	3.25	0.015	15,656	50,119	0.119	56,865
Lower Christina	3.15	0.057	14,500	43,072	0.019	43,910
New Castle-Upper Christina	3.37	0.090	20,345	62,525	0.025	64,139
Central Pencader	3.07	0.031	1,752	5,212	(-)	5,212
Red Lion	3.24	0.051	1,135	3,490	0.094	3,852
Middletown-Odessa-Townsend	2.97	0.031	2,937	8,452	0.018	8,608
Wilmington	2.91	0.090	28,412	75,238	0.018	76,655
New Castle County	3.15	0.059	125,914	373,228	0.052	393,647
Newark	2.94	0.031	6,509	18,553	0.268	25,353

*The household count is a count of dwelling units derived from the geographic base file of the Division of Urban Affairs. This count does not necessarily conform to the adjusted dwelling unit count of the 1970 United States Census.

The housing unit files maintained by the City of Wilmington contain more units than those maintained by the Division of Urban Affairs. Work is presently under way to resolve this discrepancy. The estimates and projections are based on the Division of Urban Affairs files.

TABLE 4

FEMALE POPULATION OF DELAWARE, BY AGE:
JULY 1, 1975 AND MIDYEAR PROJECTIONS, 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995

AGE GROUP	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995
0-4	24819	30954	32377	33934	36285
5-9	29769	31297	39019	40484	42136
10-14	30374	31907	33490	41690	43086
15-19	27074	28405	30018	31691	39643
20-24	24213	25423	26850	28543	30271
25-29	20493	21497	22811	24337	26111
30-34	17268	18149	19315	20768	22412
35-39	16925	17788	18674	19831	21266
40-44	17886	18744	19728	20746	22070
45-49	18056	18898	19814	20855	21926
50-54	15811	16551	17471	18468	19586
55-59	13152	13781	14594	15572	16622
60-64	11074	11621	12293	13128	14113
65-69	8929	9387	9963	10648	11470
70-74	7381	7765	8189	8714	9326
75+	11031	11624	12306	13061	13925

TABLE 5

MALE POPULATION OF DELAWARE, BY AGE:
JULY 1, 1975 AND MIDYEAR PROJECTIONS, 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995

AGE GROUP	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995
0-4	26032	31804	33307	34958	37429
5-9	30747	32305	39414	41024	42834
10-14	31742	33359	34989	42621	44143
15-19	26708	28045	29802	31589	38897
20-24	21855	23147	24695	26554	28345
25-29	19524	20506	21594	23032	24790
30-34	16557	17398	18501	19719	21239
35-39	16905	17791	18636	19722	20898
40-44	16956	17763	18683	19578	20730
45-49	17005	17800	18658	19624	20561
50-54	15423	16158	16988	17878	18871
55-59	12376	12972	13746	14610	15527
60-64	9870	10369	10952	11679	12477
65-69	7033	7399	7879	8425	9084
70-74	5203	5475	5757	6120	6532
75+	6501	6866	7225	7569	7950

TABLE 6

TOTAL POPULATION OF DELAWARE, BY AGE:
JULY 1, 1975 AND MIDYEAR PROJECTIONS, 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995

AGE GROUP	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995
0-4	50851	62758	65684	68892	73714
5-9	60516	63602	78433	81508	84970
10-14	62116	65266	68479	84311	87229
15-19	53782	56450	59820	63280	78540
20-24	46068	48570	51545	55097	58616
25-29	40017	42003	44405	47369	50901
30-34	33825	35547	37816	40487	43651
35-39	33830	35579	37310	39553	42164
40-44	34842	36507	38411	40324	42800
45-49	35061	36698	38472	40479	42487
50-54	31234	32709	34459	36346	38457
55-59	25528	26753	28340	30182	32149
60-64	20944	21990	23245	24807	26590
65-69	15962	16786	17842	19073	20554
70-74	12584	13240	13946	14834	15858
75+	17532	18490	19531	20630	21875

TABLE 7

FEMALE POPULATION OF NEW CASTLE COUNTY, BY AGE:
JULY 1, 1975 AND MIDYEAR PROJECTIONS, 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995

AGE GROUP	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995
0-4	16888	19377	20288	21419	23037
5-9	20183	20589	23766	25038	26590
10-14	20911	21333	21803	25215	26612
15-19	18935	19318	19865	20468	23857
20-24	16836	17176	17696	18382	19123
25-29	14417	14708	15214	15897	16735
30-34	11831	12070	12544	13220	14061
35-39	11573	11807	12047	12522	13198
40-44	12610	12864	13171	13490	14072
45-49	12935	13196	13489	13840	14202
50-54	11223	11449	11795	12178	12615
55-59	9185	9370	9697	10136	10611
60-64	7546	7698	7946	8322	8799
65-69	5880	5999	6209	6504	6907
70-74	4794	4890	5011	5211	5483
75+	6998	7138	7344	7608	7963

NOTE: Figures include City of Wilmington.

TABLE 8

MALE POPULATION OF NEW CASTLE COUNTY, BY AGE:
JULY 1, 1975 AND MIDYEAR PROJECTIONS, 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995

AGE GROUP	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995
0-4	17731	20131	21074	22245	23923
5-9	21058	21483	24535	25839	27433
10-14	21672	22110	22594	25847	27265
15-19	18491	18864	19520	20235	23468
20-24	13548	13821	14556	15547	16604
25-29	13481	13753	14042	14800	15821
30-34	11372	11602	12013	12452	13314
35-39	11347	11576	11821	12253	12712
40-44	12079	12323	12611	12921	13434
45-49	12184	12430	12705	13028	13373
50-54	10838	11056	11330	11636	11985
55-59	8594	8767	9067	9422	9805
60-64	6625	6759	6974	7297	7668
65-69	4550	4641	4813	5049	5367
70-74	3348	3415	3484	3613	3791
75+	3985	4065	4154	4250	4387

NOTE: Figures include City of Wilmington.

TABLE 9

TOTAL POPULATION OF NEW CASTLE COUNTY, BY AGE:
JULY 1, 1975 AND MIDYEAR PROJECTIONS, 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995

AGE GROUP	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995
0-4	34619	39508	41362	43664	46960
5-9	41241	42072	48301	50877	54023
10-14	42583	43443	44397	51062	53877
15-19	37426	38182	39385	40703	47325
20-24	30384	30997	32252	33929	35727
25-29	27898	28461	29256	30697	32556
30-34	23203	23672	24557	25672	27375
35-39	22920	23383	23868	24775	25910
40-44	24689	25187	25782	26411	27506
45-49	25119	25626	26194	26868	27575
50-54	22061	22505	23125	23814	24600
55-59	17779	18137	18764	19558	20416
60-64	14171	14457	14920	15619	16467
65-69	10430	10640	11022	11553	12274
70-74	8142	8305	8495	8824	9274
75+	10983	11203	11498	11858	12350

NOTE: Figures include City of Wilmington.

TABLE 10

FEMALE POPULATION OF KENT COUNTY, BY AGE:
JULY 1, 1975 AND MIDYEAR PROJECTIONS, 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995

AGE GROUP	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995
0-4	4204	6949	7017	6951	7056
5-9	5162	5863	9236	8852	8312
10-14	5154	5855	6519	10056	9440
15-19	4269	4849	5509	6134	9463
20-24	4127	4688	5245	5865	6428
25-29	3311	3761	4273	4781	5346
30-34	3066	3482	3921	4413	4893
35-39	2972	3375	3772	4176	4622
40-44	2528	2871	3261	3645	4035
45-49	2319	2634	2964	3334	3691
50-54	1894	2151	2444	2750	3094
55-59	1659	1884	2127	2400	2683
60-64	1447	1644	1851	2070	2315
65-69	1226	1392	1568	1750	1939
70-74	1019	1157	1297	1442	1567
75+	1714	1947	2180	2405	2622

TABLE 11

MALE POPULATION OF KENT COUNTY, BY AGE:
JULY 1, 1975 AND MIDYEAR PROJECTIONS, 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995

AGE GROUP	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995
0-4	4436	6951	7058	7036	7189
5-9	5211	5919	8887	8619	8198
10-14	5393	6126	6785	9919	9366
15-19	4460	5067	5755	6375	9319
20-24	5591	6351	6854	7362	7699
25-29	3344	3798	4315	4657	5002
30-34	2901	3295	3743	4253	4589
35-39	3180	3611	3963	4338	4749
40-44	2439	2770	3147	3453	3780
45-49	2244	2548	2861	3209	3479
50-54	1973	2242	2525	2810	3126
55-59	1562	1774	2016	2271	2527
60-64	1397	1587	1762	1955	2150
65-69	968	1099	1249	1386	1538
70-74	716	813	907	1011	1102
75+	1144	1299	1425	1516	1588

TABLE 12

TOTAL POPULATION OF KENT COUNTY, BY AGE:
JULY 1, 1975 AND MIDYEAR PROJECTIONS, 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995

AGE GROUP	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995
0-4	8640	13900	14075	13987	14245
5-9	10373	11782	18123	17471	16510
10-14	10547	11981	13304	19975	18806
15-19	8729	9916	11264	12509	18782
20-24	9718	11039	12099	13227	14127
25-29	6655	7559	8588	9438	10348
30-34	5967	6777	7664	8666	9482
35-39	6152	6986	7735	8514	9371
40-44	4967	5641	6408	7098	7815
45-49	4563	5182	5825	6543	7170
50-54	3867	4393	4969	5560	6220
55-59	3221	3658	4143	4671	5210
60-64	2844	3231	3613	4025	4465
65-69	2194	2491	2817	3136	3477
70-74	1735	1970	2204	2453	2689
75+	2858	3246	3605	3921	4210

TABLE 13

FEMALE POPULATION OF SUSSEX COUNTY, BY AGE:
JULY 1, 1975 AND MIDYEAR PROJECTIONS, 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995

AGE GROUP	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995
0-4	3727	4628	5072	5564	6192
5-9	4424	4845	6017	6594	7234
10-14	4309	4719	5168	6419	7034
15-19	3870	4238	4644	5089	6323
20-24	3250	3559	3909	4296	4720
25-29	2765	3028	3324	3659	4030
30-34	2371	2597	2850	3135	3458
35-39	2380	2606	2855	3133	3446
40-44	2748	3009	3296	3611	3963
45-49	2802	3068	3361	3681	4033
50-54	2694	2951	3232	3540	3877
55-59	2308	2527	2770	3036	3328
60-64	2081	2279	2496	2736	2999
65-69	1823	1996	2186	2394	2624
70-74	1568	1718	1881	2061	2256
75+	2319	2539	2782	3048	3340

NOTE: Figures refer to permanent residents of the county and do not include seasonal population.

TABLE 14

MALE POPULATION OF SUSSEX COUNTY, BY AGE:
JULY 1, 1975 AND MIDYEAR PROJECTIONS, 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995

AGE GROUP	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995
0-4	3865	4722	5175	5677	6317
5-9	4478	4903	5992	6566	7203
10-14	4677	5123	5610	6855	7512
15-19	3757	4114	4527	4979	6110
20-24	2716	2975	3285	3645	4042
25-29	2699	2955	3237	3575	3967
30-34	2284	2501	2745	3014	3336
35-39	2378	2604	2852	3131	3437
40-44	2438	2670	2925	3204	3516
45-49	2577	2822	3092	3387	3709
50-54	2612	2860	3133	3432	3760
55-59	2220	2431	2663	2917	3195
60-64	1848	2023	2216	2427	2659
65-69	1515	1659	1817	1990	2179
70-74	1139	1247	1366	1496	1639
75+	1372	1502	1646	1803	1975

NOTE: Figures refer to permanent residents of the county and do not include seasonal population.

TABLE 15

TOTAL POPULATION OF SUSSEX COUNTY, BY AGE:
JULY 1, 1975 AND MIDYEAR PROJECTIONS, 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995

AGE GROUP	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995
0-4	7592	9350	10247	11241	12509
5-9	8902	9748	12009	13160	14437
10-14	8986	9842	10778	13274	14546
15-19	7627	8352	9171	10068	12433
20-24	5966	6534	7194	7941	8762
25-29	5464	5983	6561	7234	7997
30-34	4655	5098	5595	6149	6794
35-39	4758	5210	5707	6264	6883
40-44	5186	5679	6221	6815	7479
45-49	5379	5890	6453	7068	7742
50-54	5306	5811	6365	6972	7637
55-59	4528	4958	5433	5953	6523
60-64	3929	4302	4712	5163	5658
65-69	3338	3655	4003	4384	4803
70-74	2707	2965	3247	3557	3895
75+	3691	4041	4428	4851	5315

NOTE: Figures refer to permanent residents of the county and do not include seasonal population.

TABLE 16

FEMALE POPULATION OF WILMINGTON CITY, BY AGE:
JULY 1, 1975 AND MIDYEAR PROJECTIONS: 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995

AGE GROUP	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995
0-4	3053	3998	3959	4090	4542
5-9	3602	3434	4582	4623	4863
10-14	3553	3388	3289	4470	4590
15-19	3366	3209	3156	3160	4420
20-24	3046	2904	2898	2980	3109
25-29	2251	2147	2298	2552	2882
30-34	1954	1862	1883	2134	2496
35-39	1861	1775	1739	1808	2102
40-44	1971	1879	1798	1768	1844
45-49	2460	2346	2300	2265	2288
50-54	2579	2459	2356	2321	2295
55-59	2535	2416	2318	2235	2215
60-64	2512	2395	2286	2196	2120
65-69	2127	2027	2008	1990	1980
70-74	1807	1723	1679	1699	1718
75+	2725	2598	2584	2652	2810

NOTE: Household counts are derived from the geographic base file of the Division of Urban Affairs, University of Delaware, and may not agree with updated counts based on the 1970 census.

TABLE 17

MALE POPULATION OF WILMINGTON CITY, BY AGE:
JULY 1, 1975 AND MIDYEAR PROJECTIONS, 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995

AGE GROUP	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995
0-4	3125	4125	4077	4205	4661
5-9	3638	3469	4657	4682	4908
10-14	3726	3553	3410	4608	4662
15-19	3159	3013	3070	3141	4501
20-24	2284	2177	2347	2675	3019
25-29	1945	1855	1884	2158	2601
30-34	1716	1635	1642	1754	2105
35-39	1675	1598	1550	1586	1723
40-44	1779	1696	1626	1586	1630
45-49	2032	1937	1880	1836	1822
50-54	2078	1981	1897	1850	1814
55-59	2148	2047	1973	1910	1882
60-64	1864	1778	1725	1693	1667
65-69	1452	1384	1360	1358	1370
70-74	1172	1117	1069	1055	1058
75+	1459	1391	1351	1327	1331

NOTE: Household counts are derived from the geographic base file of the Division of Urban Affairs, University of Delaware, and may not agree with updated counts based on the 1970 census.

TABLE 18

TOTAL POPULATION OF WILMINGTON CITY, BY AGE:
JULY 1, 1975 AND MIDYEAR PROJECTIONS, 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995

AGE GROUP	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995
0-4	6178	8123	8036	8295	9203
5-9	7240	6903	9239	9305	9771
10-14	7279	6941	6699	9078	9252
15-19	6525	6222	6226	6301	8921
20-24	5330	5081	5245	5655	6128
25-29	4196	4002	4182	4710	5483
30-34	3670	3497	3525	3888	4601
35-39	3536	3373	3289	3394	3825
40-44	3750	3575	3424	3354	3474
45-49	4492	4283	4180	4101	4110
50-54	4657	4440	4253	4171	4109
55-59	4683	4463	4291	4145	4097
60-64	4376	4173	4011	3869	3787
65-69	3579	3411	3368	3348	3350
70-74	2979	2840	2748	2754	2776
75+	4184	3989	3935	3979	4141

NOTE: Household counts are derived from the geographic base file of the Division of Urban Affairs, University of Delaware, and may not agree with updated counts based on the 1970 census.

TABLE 19

FEMALE POPULATION OF NEWARK CITY, BY AGE:
JULY 1, 1975 AND MIDYEAR PROJECTIONS, 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995

AGE GROUP	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995
0-4	861	475	571	665	691
5-9	931	1125	606	711	807
10-14	888	1073	1280	680	787
15-19	2610	3156	3545	3894	1897
20-24	2335	2823	3388	3775	4114
25-29	899	1086	1314	1577	1757
30-34	563	680	823	995	1194
35-39	519	627	750	897	1073
40-44	618	747	875	1013	1170
45-49	584	705	841	972	1108
50-54	522	630	755	691	1018
55-59	427	517	623	743	873
60-64	330	398	482	581	693
65-69	248	300	362	438	528
70-74	195	236	283	339	407
75+	313	377	451	533	626

TABLE 20

MALE POPULATION OF NEWARK CITY, BY AGE:
JULY 1, 1975 AND MIDYEAR PROJECTIONS, 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995

AGE GROUP	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995
0-4	879	486	585	683	711
5-9	931	1124	608	716	816
10-14	961	1162	1376	729	840
15-19	2304	2784	3150	3463	1697
20-24	2505	3029	3572	3937	4217
25-29	954	1153	1395	1645	1813
30-34	684	827	1000	1209	1426
35-39	541	654	791	956	1157
40-44	546	660	782	927	1099
45-49	579	700	825	954	1102
50-54	511	617	738	861	984
55-59	365	441	534	638	744
60-64	280	338	407	489	582
65-69	175	211	255	307	369
70-74	133	161	191	226	267
75+	162	196	233	273	317

TABLE 21

TOTAL POPULATION OF NEWARK CITY, BY AGE:
JULY 1, 1975 AND MIDYEAR PROJECTIONS, 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995

AGE GROUP	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995
0-4	1740	961	1156	1348	1402
5-9	1862	2249	1214	1427	1623
10-14	1849	2235	2656	1409	1627
15-19	4914	5940	6695	7357	3594
20-24	4840	5852	6960	7712	8331
25-29	1853	2239	2709	3222	3570
30-34	1247	1507	1823	2204	2620
35-39	1060	1281	1541	1853	2230
40-44	1164	1407	1657	1940	2269
45-49	1163	1405	1666	1926	2210
50-54	1033	1247	1493	1752	2002
55-59	792	958	1157	1381	1617
60-64	610	736	889	1070	1275
65-69	423	511	617	745	897
70-74	328	397	474	565	674
75+	475	573	684	806	943

TABLE 22

FEMALE POPULATION OF DOVER CITY, BY AGE:
JULY 1, 1975 AND MIDYEAR PROJECTIONS, 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995

AGE GROUP	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995
0-4	943	1591	1617	1592	1584
5-9	1212	1384	2164	2017	1812
10-14	1338	1528	1661	2462	2173
15-19	1491	1702	1847	1900	2660
20-24	1146	1308	1493	1620	1667
25-29	888	1014	1158	1322	1434
30-34	757	863	986	1126	1286
35-39	763	872	963	1063	1173
40-44	694	792	895	978	1067
45-49	611	697	792	890	968
50-54	527	602	684	775	869
55-59	434	495	566	644	729
60-64	412	469	520	574	632
65-69	305	349	398	440	486
70-74	260	296	331	368	396
75+	392	447	505	561	617

TABLE 23

MALE POPULATION OF DOVER CITY BY AGE:
JULY 1, 1975 AND MIDYEAR PROJECTIONS, 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995

AGE GROUP	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995
0-4	985	1621	1655	1638	1639
5-9	1235	1409	2158	2031	1845
10-14	1183	1351	1511	2264	2086
15-19	1322	1510	1636	1729	2444
20-24	1123	1282	1464	1587	1677
25-29	774	883	1009	1152	1249
30-34	653	745	851	972	1110
35-39	781	891	953	1011	1070
40-44	633	723	825	882	937
45-49	583	665	746	836	877
50-54	514	586	660	731	808
55-59	377	430	491	553	613
60-64	347	395	434	476	514
65-69	200	229	261	287	314
70-74	134	152	174	198	216
75+	200	228	249	265	277

TABLE 24

TOTAL POPULATION OF DOVER CITY, BY AGE:
JULY 1, 1975 AND MIDYEAR PROJECTIONS, 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995

AGE GROUP	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995
0-4	1928	3212	3272	3230	3223
5-9	2447	2793	4322	4048	3657
10-14	2521	2879	3172	4726	4259
15-19	2813	3212	3483	3629	5104
20-24	2269	2590	2957	3207	3344
25-29	1662	1897	2167	2474	2683
30-34	1410	1608	1837	2098	2396
35-39	1544	1763	1916	2074	2243
40-44	1327	1515	1720	1860	2004
45-49	1194	1362	1538	1726	1845
50-54	1041	1188	1344	1506	1677
55-59	811	925	1057	1197	1342
60-64	759	864	954	1050	1146
65-69	505	578	659	727	800
70-74	394	448	505	566	612
75+	592	675	754	826	894

TABLE 25

FEMALE MIGRATION RATIOS, B. AGE, FOR THE POPULATION OF NEW CASTLE COUNTY: 1975-1980 TO 1990-1995

AGE GROUP	1975-1980	1980-1985	1985-1990	1990-1995
0-4	1.1987	1.2053	1.2120	1.2186
5-9	1.2231	1.2305	1.2380	1.2454
10-14	1.0586	1.0605	1.0625	1.0645
15-19	0.9254	0.9328	0.9404	0.9478
20-24	0.9093	0.9183	0.9275	0.9365
25-29	0.8769	0.8891	0.9016	0.9138
30-34	0.8415	0.8572	0.8734	0.8891
35-39	1.0042	1.0043	1.0045	1.0046
40-44	1.1237	1.1278	1.1320	1.1361
45-49	1.0644	1.0665	1.0687	1.0708
50-54	0.9098	0.9187	0.9279	0.9369
55-59	0.8731	0.8857	0.8986	0.9112
60-64	0.8937	0.9042	0.9151	0.9256
65-69	0.8719	0.8846	0.8976	0.9103
70-74	0.9564	0.9607	0.9652	0.9695
75+	0.9202	0.9281	0.9362	0.9441

TABLE 26

MALE MIGRATION RATIOS, BY AGE, FOR THE POPULATION OF NEW CASTLE COUNTY: 1975-1980 TO 1990-1995

AGE GROUP	1975-1980	1980-1985	1985-1990	1990-1995
0-4	1.1922	1.1985	1.2051	1.2114
5-9	1.2165	1.2236	1.2310	1.2381
10-14	1.0522	1.0539	1.0557	1.0574
15-19	0.8744	0.8868	0.8996	0.9121
20-24	0.7542	0.7785	0.8036	0.8279
25-29	1.0251	1.0259	1.0268	1.0276
30-34	0.8689	0.8819	0.8953	0.9082
35-39	1.0301	1.0311	1.0321	1.0331
40-44	1.1054	1.1089	1.1125	1.1159
45-49	1.0608	1.0628	1.0649	1.0669
50-54	0.9561	0.9604	0.9649	0.9693
55-59	0.8780	0.8901	0.9025	0.9146
60-64	0.8963	0.9066	0.9171	0.9274
65-69	0.8578	0.8719	0.8864	0.9005
70-74	1.0003	1.0003	1.0003	1.0003
75+	0.9820	0.9838	0.9856	0.9874

TABLE 27

FEMALE MIGRATION RATIOS, BY AGE, FOR THE POPULATION OF KENT COUNTY: 1975-1980 TO 1990-1995

AGE GROUP	1975-1980	1980-1985	1985-1990	1990-1995
0-4	1.3712	1.3100	1.2468	1.1856
5-9	1.3992	1.3333	1.2655	1.1996
10-14	1.1360	1.1136	1.0904	1.0680
15-19	0.9426	0.9426	0.9426	0.9426
20-24	1.1009	1.0843	1.0671	1.0505
25-29	0.9149	0.9149	0.9149	0.9149
30-34	1.0572	1.0478	1.0380	1.0286
35-39	1.1079	1.0901	1.0718	1.0540
40-44	0.9768	0.9768	0.9768	0.9768
45-49	1.0599	1.0500	1.0398	1.0299
50-54	0.9537	0.9537	0.9537	0.9537
55-59	1.0404	1.0337	1.0269	1.0202
60-64	1.0569	1.0475	1.0378	1.0285
65-69	1.0552	1.0461	1.0367	1.0276
70-74	1.0860	1.0718	1.0572	1.0430
75+	1.0962	1.0803	1.0640	1.0481

TABLE 28

MALE MIGRATION RATIOS, BY AGE, FOR THE POPULATION OF KENT COUNTY: 1975-1980 TO 1990-1995

AGE GROUP	1975-1980	1980-1985	1985-1990	1990-1995
0-4	1.3130	1.2614	1.2081	1.1565
5-9	1.3398	1.2837	1.2260	1.1699
10-14	1.1781	1.1487	1.1184	1.0891
15-19	0.9438	0.9438	0.9438	0.9438
20-24	1.4370	1.3649	1.2906	1.2185
25-29	0.6861	0.6861	0.6861	0.6861
30-34	0.9950	0.9950	0.9950	0.9950
35-39	1.2598	1.2169	1.1728	1.1299
40-44	0.8869	0.8869	0.8869	0.8869
45-49	1.0772	1.0645	1.0513	1.0386
50-54	1.0527	1.0440	1.0350	1.0264
55-59	0.9760	0.9760	0.9760	0.9760
60-64	1.1581	1.1320	1.1051	1.0791
65-69	0.9634	0.9634	0.9634	0.9634
70-74	1.1193	1.0996	1.0793	1.0597
75+	1.2684	1.2241	1.1785	1.1342

TABLE 29

FEMALE MIGRATION RATIOS, BY AGE, FOR THE POPULATION OF SUSSEX COUNTY: 1975-1980 TO 1990-1995

AGE GROUP	1975-1980	1980-1985	1985-1990	1990-1995
0-4	1.2781	1.2781	1.2781	1.2781
5-9	1.3042	1.3042	1.3042	1.3042
10-14	1.0684	1.0684	1.0684	1.0684
15-19	0.9853	0.9858	0.9863	0.9868
20-24	0.9220	0.9246	0.9272	0.9298
25-29	0.9352	0.9373	0.9395	0.9417
30-34	0.9443	0.9461	0.9480	0.9499
35-39	1.1062	1.1062	1.1062	1.1062
40-44	1.2785	1.2785	1.2785	1.2785
45-49	1.1358	1.1358	1.1358	1.1358
50-54	1.0827	1.0827	1.0827	1.0827
55-59	0.9810	0.9816	0.9823	0.9829
60-64	1.0531	1.0531	1.0531	1.0531
65-69	1.0520	1.0520	1.0520	1.0520
70-74	1.0839	1.0839	1.0839	1.0839
75+	0.9942	0.9944	0.9946	0.9948

TABLE 30

MALE MIGRATION RATIOS. BY AGE. FOR THE POPULATION OF SUSSEX COUNTY: 1975-1980 TO 1990-1995

AGE GROUP	1975-1980	1980-1985	1985-1990	1990-1995
0-4	1.2484	1.2484	1.2484	1.2484
5-9	1.2739	1.2739	1.2739	1.2739
10-14	1.1465	1.1465	1.1465	1.1465
15-19	0.8838	0.8876	0.8916	0.8954
20-24	0.7990	0.8056	0.8125	0.8191
25-29	1.0989	1.0989	1.0989	1.0989
30-34	0.9357	0.9378	0.9400	0.9421
35-39	1.1541	1.1541	1.1541	1.1541
40-44	1.1431	1.1431	1.1431	1.1431
45-49	1.1935	1.1935	1.1935	1.1935
50-54	1.1697	1.1697	1.1697	1.1697
55-59	1.0103	1.0103	1.0103	1.0103
60-64	1.0388	1.0388	1.0388	1.0388
65-69	1.0993	1.0993	1.0993	1.0993
70-74	1.0975	1.0975	1.0975	1.0975
75+	1.0613	1.0613	1.0613	1.0613

TABLE 31

FEMALE MIGRATION RATIOS, BY AGE, FOR THE POPULATION OF WILMINGTON CITY: 1975-1980 TO 1990-1995

AGE GROUP	1975-1980	1980-1985	1985-1990	1990-1995
0-4	1.1059	1.1234	1.1414	1.1588
5-9	1.1285	1.1497	1.1715	1.1928
10-14	0.9421	0.9593	0.9770	0.9942
15-19	0.9050	0.9332	0.9623	0.9905
20-24	0.8649	0.9050	0.9464	0.9865
25-29	0.7075	0.7944	0.8839	0.9708
30-34	0.8318	0.8818	0.9332	0.9832
35-39	0.9141	0.9396	0.9659	0.9914
40-44	1.0208	1.0242	1.0278	1.0312
45-49	1.2106	1.2453	1.2812	1.3159
50-54	1.0277	1.0323	1.0370	1.0416
55-59	0.9799	0.9859	0.9920	0.9980
60-64	1.0076	1.0089	1.0101	1.0114
65-69	0.8854	0.9194	0.9545	0.9885
70-74	0.9319	0.9521	0.9730	0.9932
75+	0.8740	0.9114	0.9500	0.9874

TABLE 32

MALE MIGRATION RATIOS, B. AGE, FOR THE POPULATION OF WILMINGTON CITY: 1975-1980 TO 1990-1995

AGE GROUP	1975-1980	1980-1985	1985-1990	1990-1995
0-4	1.0923	1.1075	1.1232	1.1385
5-9	1.1146	1.1335	1.1530	1.1719
10-14	0.9787	0.9850	0.9915	0.9979
15-19	0.8123	0.8680	0.9255	0.9812
20-24	0.6956	0.7860	0.8792	0.9696
25-29	0.8202	0.8736	0.9286	0.9820
30-34	0.8490	0.8938	0.9401	0.9849
35-39	0.9425	0.9596	0.9772	0.9943
40-44	1.0308	1.0359	1.0411	1.0462
45-49	1.1226	1.1428	1.1637	1.1839
50-54	1.0274	1.0319	1.0366	1.0411
55-59	1.0696	1.0811	1.0929	1.1044
60-64	0.9434	0.9602	0.9775	0.9943
65-69	0.9095	0.9364	0.9641	0.9910
70-74	1.0253	1.0295	1.0338	1.0380
75+	0.9402	0.9580	0.9763	0.9940

TABLE 33

FEMALE MIGRATION RATIOS, BY AGE, FOR THE POPULATION OF NEWARK CITY: 1975-1980 TO 1990-1995

AGE GROUP	1975-1980	1980-1985	1985-1990	1990-1995
0-4	1.2849	1.2567	1.2277	1.1994
5-9	1.3112	1.2804	1.2486	1.2178
10-14	1.1553	1.1400	1.1241	1.1087
15-19	3.5604	3.3070	3.0458	2.7923
20-24	1.0844	1.0761	1.0675	1.0591
25-29	0.4672	0.4672	0.4672	0.4672
30-34	0.7613	0.7613	0.7613	0.7613
35-39	1.1217	1.1096	1.0972	1.0852
40-44	1.4554	1.4103	1.3639	1.3188
45-49	1.1618	1.1458	1.1293	1.1132
50-54	1.1103	1.0994	1.0881	1.0772
55-59	1.0364	1.0328	1.0291	1.0255
60-64	0.9946	0.9946	0.9946	0.9946
65-69	0.9970	0.9970	0.9970	0.9970
70-74	1.0959	1.0864	1.0766	1.0672
75+	1.1400	1.1261	1.1118	1.0980

TABLE 34

MALE MIGRATION RATIOS, BY AGE, FOR THE POPULATION OF NEWARK CITY: 1975-1980 TO 1990-1995

AGE GROUP	1975-1980	1980-1985	1985-1990	1990-1995
0-4	1.2592	1.2335	1.2071	1.1814
5-9	1.2848	1.2566	1.2276	1.1994
10-14	1.2515	1.2266	1.2009	1.1760
15-19	2.9108	2.7216	2.5267	2.3376
20-24	1.3268	1.2944	1.2611	1.2288
25-29	0.4650	0.4650	0.4650	0.4650
30-34	0.8754	0.8754	0.8754	0.8754
35-39	0.9680	0.9680	0.9680	0.9680
40-44	1.2419	1.2179	1.1932	1.1693
45-49	1.3217	1.2899	1.2571	1.2252
50-54	1.1236	1.1113	1.0987	1.0865
55-59	0.9387	0.9387	0.9387	0.9387
60-64	1.0553	1.0499	1.0442	1.0387
65-69	0.9245	0.9245	0.9245	0.9245
70-74	1.2281	1.2055	1.1822	1.1597
75+	1.1796	1.1618	1.1435	1.1257

TABLE 35

FEMALE MIGRATION RATIOS, BY AGE, FOR THE POPULATION OF DOVER CITY: 1975-1980 TO 1990-1995

AGE GROUP	1975-1980	1980-1985	1985-1990	1990-1995
0-4	1.4437	1.3412	1.2356	1.1331
5-9	1.4731	1.3638	1.2512	1.1419
10-14	1.2627	1.2020	1.1395	1.0788
15-19	1.2743	1.2110	1.1457	1.0823
20-24	0.8796	0.8796	0.8796	0.8796
25-29	0.8885	0.8885	0.8885	0.8885
30-34	0.9779	0.9779	0.9779	0.9779
35-39	1.1591	1.1224	1.0845	1.0477
40-44	1.0500	1.0384	1.0265	1.0150
45-49	1.0215	1.0165	1.0114	1.0065
50-54	1.0130	1.0100	1.0069	1.0039
55-59	0.9836	0.9836	0.9836	0.9836
60-64	1.1542	1.1186	1.0819	1.0463
65-69	0.9291	0.9291	0.9291	0.9291
70-74	1.1190	1.0915	1.0632	1.0357
75+	1.0456	1.0351	1.0242	1.0137

TABLE 36

MALE MIGRATION RATIOS, BY AGE, FOR THE POPULATION OF DOVER CITY: 1975-1980 TO 1990-1995

AGE GROUP	1975-1980	1980-1985	1985-1990	1990-1995
0-4	1.4082	1.3139	1.2168	1.1225
5-9	1.4370	1.3360	1.2320	1.1311
10-14	1.0963	1.0741	1.0512	1.0289
15-19	1.2823	1.2171	1.1499	1.0847
20-24	0.9787	0.9787	0.9787	0.9787
25-29	0.7946	0.7946	0.7946	0.7946
30-34	0.9729	0.9729	0.9729	0.9729
35-39	1.3810	1.2930	1.2023	1.1143
40-44	0.9428	0.9428	0.9428	0.9428
45-49	1.0833	1.0641	1.0443	1.0250
50-54	1.0606	1.0466	1.0322	1.0182
55-59	0.9095	0.9095	0.9095	0.9095
60-64	1.1959	1.1507	1.1040	1.0588
65-69	0.8088	0.8088	0.8083	0.8088
70-74	1.0177	1.0136	1.0094	1.0053
75+	1.2351	1.1808	1.1249	1.0705

TABLE 37

FEMALE SURVIVAL RATIOS, BY AGE: 1975-1980 TO 1990-1995

AGE GROUP	1975-1980	1980-1985	1985-1990	1990-1995
BIRTH	0.9820	0.9820	0.9820	0.9820
0-4	0.9968	0.9968	0.9968	0.9968
5-9	0.9985	0.9985	0.9985	0.9985
10-14	0.9983	0.9983	0.9983	0.9983
15-19	0.9976	0.9976	0.9976	0.9976
20-24	0.9963	0.9963	0.9963	0.9963
25-29	0.9949	0.9949	0.9949	0.9949
30-34	0.9938	0.9938	0.9938	0.9938
35-39	0.9892	0.9892	0.9892	0.9892
40-44	0.9832	0.9832	0.9832	0.9832
45-49	0.9729	0.9729	0.9729	0.9729
50-54	0.9563	0.9563	0.9563	0.9563
55-59	0.9379	0.9379	0.9379	0.9379
60-64	0.9118	0.9118	0.9118	0.9118
65-69	0.8696	0.8696	0.8696	0.8696
70-74	0.7976	0.7976	0.7976	0.7976
75+	0.5622	0.5622	0.5622	0.5622

TABLE 38

MALE SURVIVAL RATIOS, BY AGE: 1975-1980 TO 1990-1995

AGE GROUP	1975-1980	1980-1985	1985-1990	1990-1995
BIRTH	0.9769	0.9769	0.9769	0.9769
0-4	0.9960	0.9960	.9960	0.9960
5-9	0.9979	0.9979	9979	0.9979
10-14	0.9955	0.9955	0.9955	0.9955
15-19	0.9911	0.9911	0.9911	0.9911
20-24	0.9903	0.9903	0.9903	0.9903
25-29	0.9905	0.9905	0.9905	0.9905
30-34	0.9882	0.9882	0.9882	0.9882
35-39	0.9825	0.9825	0.9825	0.9825
40-44	0.9701	0.9701	0.9701	0.9701
45-49	0.9491	0.9491	0.9491	0.9491
50-54	0.9214	0.9214	0.9214	0.9214
55-59	0.8775	0.8775	0.8775	0.8775
60-64	0.8168	0.8168	0.8168	0.8168
65-69	0.7505	0.7505	0.7505	0.7505
70-74	0.6674	0.6674	0.6674	0.6674
75+	0.4781	0.4781	0.4781	0.4781

TABLE 39

GENERAL FERTILITY RATES: 1975-1980 TO 1990-1995

Area	1975-1980	1980-1985	1985-1990	1990-1995
New Castle County	67.4	68.5	69.7	70.8
Kent County	87.7	81.9	75.9	70.2
Sussex County	71.5	71.5	71.5	71.5
Wilmington City	91.4	91.4	91.4	91.4
Newark City	17.2	17.8	18.4	18.9
Dover City	67.7	65.5	63.2	60.9

Note: Rates are average annual births per 1,000 women aged 15 to 49.